



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/585,762	06/02/2000	Dirk Van Hyning	5019	5865
25280	7590	09/10/2002		
MILLIKEN & COMPANY 920 MILLIKEN RD PO BOX 1926 SPARTANBURG, SC 29304			EXAMINER	
			WACHTEL, ALEXIS A	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1771	10	
DATE MAILED: 09/10/2002				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/585,762	HYNING, DIRK VAN	
	Examiner Alexis Wachtel	Art Unit 1771	
<p>-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</p> <p>Period for Reply</p> <p>A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 			
Status			
<p>1)<input type="checkbox"/> Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>6-7-2002</u>.</p> <p>2a)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This action is FINAL. 2b)<input type="checkbox"/> This action is non-final.</p> <p>3)<input type="checkbox"/> Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i>, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.</p>			
Disposition of Claims			
<p>4)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are pending in the application.</p> <p>4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.</p> <p>5)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.</p> <p>6)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are rejected.</p> <p>7)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.</p> <p>8)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</p>			
Application Papers			
<p>9)<input type="checkbox"/> The specification is objected to by the Examiner.</p> <p>10)<input type="checkbox"/> The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)<input type="checkbox"/> accepted or b)<input type="checkbox"/> objected to by the Examiner.</p> <p>Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).</p> <p>11)<input type="checkbox"/> The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)<input type="checkbox"/> approved b)<input type="checkbox"/> disapproved by the Examiner.</p> <p>If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.</p> <p>12)<input type="checkbox"/> The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.</p>			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
<p>13)<input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</p> <p>a)<input type="checkbox"/> All b)<input type="checkbox"/> Some * c)<input type="checkbox"/> None of:</p> <p>1.<input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</p> <p>2.<input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.</p> <p>3.<input type="checkbox"/> Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</p> <p>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</p>			
<p>14)<input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).</p> <p>a)<input type="checkbox"/> The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.</p> <p>15)<input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.</p>			
Attachment(s)			
<p>1)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</p> <p>2)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</p> <p>3)<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.</p>		<p>4)<input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.</p> <p>5)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)</p> <p>6)<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</p>	

Detailed Action

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment and accompanying Remarks filed on 5-31-2002 have been entered and carefully considered.

The amendment is sufficient to overcome the nonstatutory double patenting rejection of claims 1-16, but is insufficient to overcome the anticipation rejections of claims 1-16.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,849,311 to Sawan et al as per sections 4-6 of the last office action.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant relies on a Declaration under 37.C.F.R. § 1.132 to overcome the rejections of claims 1-16. Applicant has relied on Example 3 of Sawan et al in order to complete a comparative experiment wherein the silver content of the coating disclosed by Sawan et al is evaluated for wash durability when applied to a fabric. Examiner notes that the wash durability of Sawan et al's coating inherently possesses the claimed properties of the instant Application. According to the supplied Declaration, the process of Sawan et al was used as per example 3 of Sawan et al's disclosure in order to apply

a biocidal coating to said fabric. Applicant's results show that at most, about 25% of a silver containing biocidal coating remained on said fabric after being subjected to AATCC 130-1981 home wash testing protocols. The claims as amended require an amount of at least 50% of silver containing coating to be retained after being subjected to AATCC 130-1981 home wash testing protocols. Example 3 of Sawan et al's disclosure made use of a 0.05% solution of Ag/KI in conjunction with a base coating matrix to render said fabric antimicrobial. However, Examiner wishes to point out to Applicant that Sawan et al clearly enables a greater amount of Ag/KI to be used. In particular, silver solutions having a concentration from about 0.005 to about 0.5% are identified as useful (Col 10, lines 55-60). Examiner wishes to point out that Sawan et al's disclosure is enabling for a silver amount that is 10 times greater than the amount used in Example 3 of Sawan et al's disclosure. Thusly, it cannot be said that the supplied Declaration under 37.C.F.R. § 1.132 overcomes the teachings of Sawan et al since the closest teachings found within the four corners of the Sawan et al reference have not been relied on or used in conducting an experimental comparison for the purposes of overcoming Examiner's inherency arguments. While Sawan et al may disclose more than what Applicant wishes to limit their claims to, the disclosure of Sawan et al clearly includes subject matter encompassed by the scope of the instant claims. Perhaps the claims should be amended to account for the claimed properties with more chemical and structural definition.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office Action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Alex Wachtel, whose number is (703)-306-0320. The Examiner can normally be reached Mondays-Fridays from 10:30am to 6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful and the matter is urgent, the Examiner's supervisor, Mr. Terrel Morris, can be reached at (703) 308-2414. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.



TERREL MORRIS
SUPervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700